

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended.

No claims have been amended. Claims 11-18 have been cancelled without prejudice.

Therefore, claims 1-10 are now presented for examination.

Drawings

Claim 11 having the limitation of two graphics controllers coupled to the AGP bus has been cancelled without prejudice. Accordingly, drawing corrections in light of claim 11 are not necessitated.

Double Patenting

Claims 1-18 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-2, 7-10 and 15-16 of U.S. Patent No. 6,717,581.

With regard to double patenting, Applicant respectfully herewith submits a terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321 (c) to overcome the rejection of double patenting.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

Claims 1-11 and 13-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Olarig et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,167,476 (“Olarig”).

Olarig discloses “a core logic capable of accepting an AGP bus . . . with an AGP to AGP bridge connected to the standard AGP bus. The AGP to AGP bridge can accommodate two or more AGP-compatible devices that can be accessed through the standard AGP bus via the AGP to AGP bridge” (Abstract). Stated differently, Olarig discloses *a core logic chip, an AGP bus, and an AGP bridge adapted for operation of two or more AGP-compatible devices*. Olarig further discloses having the “*video graphics*

controller connected to the core logic through the first AGP bus[, where the] . . . video graphics controller is an AGP-compatible device” (col. 8, lines 12-16). Olarig merely discloses a core logic, an AGP bus, an AGP bridge, and an AGP-compatible device, such as a video graphics controller (see Abstract; Figure 3A). Olarig does not teach or reasonably suggest the receiving AGP transaction requests at a first bus interface from a core logic device, as recited by claim 1.

At best, Olarig discloses the AGP device as a master device and “[w]hen the *master has completed transferring all the requests it has, the AGP to AGP bridge will process the write commands*. The master will need to get write data into the AGP to AGP bridge so that, *when the core logic requests the data, the master will have the data available*” (col. 15, lines 11-21). This is not the same as receiving accelerated AGP transaction requests . . . from the core logic device, as recited by claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims.

Claims 5 and 8 contain limitations similar to those of claim 1 and accordingly, Applicant respectfully request the removal of the rejection of claim 5 and 8 and their dependent claims.

Claims 13-16 have been cancelled without prejudice.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 12, 17, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over “Olarig” in view of Jeddelloh, U.S. Patent No. 6,477,623 (“Jeddelloh”) or Aleksic et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,469,703 (“Aleksic”).

Claims 12, 17 and 18 have been cancelled without prejudice.

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is hereby earnestly requested.

Invitation for a Telephone Interview

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Request for an Extension of Time

Applicants respectfully petition for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a) for such an extension.

Charge our Deposit Account

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: November 10, 2004


Aslam A. Jaffery
Reg. No. 51,841

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1030
(303) 740-1980